REMARKS

Claims 1-76 are pending. Claims 39-57 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-38 and 58-76 stand rejected by the Office Action.

The arguments provided in the Office Action appear not to address the amendments to independent claims 1, 10, 58, 67, and 68 that were introduced in the Applicant's paper filed in response to the previous Office Action mailed March 1, 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-19 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,310,349 (Daniels) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,261,103 (Stephens).

Regarding claim 1, the combination of Daniels and Stephens fails to even suggest the feature of "selecting a second destination **within the server** to interact with the one or more users." (Emphasis added.) The Office Action admits that "Daniels does not explicitly disclose: selecting a second destination to interact with the one or more users and modifying the interaction parameters for the one or more users in accordance with second destination." The Office Action also alleges that (Page 3, first paragraph.):

> Stephens discloses an interactive multimedia system for enabling students, teachers And administrators to interactive [interact] including a second destination and (i.e., Student home to interact with the one or more users (see figs 10 and 11 and col. 17, lines 31-67).

Stephens does disclose (Column 17, lines 31-67. Emphasis added.):

> FIG. 10 depicts a flowchart 1000 of an illustrative embodiment of an interactive program according to the invention. Beginning at 1002, program 1000 monitors the data being received from data acquisition module 108. At 1004, program 1000 compares the received experimental data with sample data stored in coursework library 136. As illustrated at 1006, if program 1000 detects anomalous deviations between the sample data and the actual data, it prompts 1008 the participant. The prompt can for example, take the form of a message dialog displayed in the "Main Chart" window 400. **In response to the prompt, the participant can signal the data acquisition unit 108 and/or a local participant at local workstation 04 by way of remote workstation 106 and Internet 128,** to verify the correctness of experimental setup 102.

> Subsequent to recording either real-time or played back data, the student performs selected measurements in accord with the course materials associated with the particular laboratory experiment. According to the illustrated embodiment the student performs the measurements from the "Analysis" window 500 of FIG. 5. The interactive programs of application programs 134 monitor the measurements being performed.
>
> FIG. 11 depicts a flowchart 1100 of an illustrative embodiment of an interactive program according to the invention. Beginning at 1102, program 1100 monitors various aspects of the students measurements, such as cursor placement. At 1104, the program 1100 compares the student's measurement with example measurements stored in the course work library 136. As shown at 1106 and 1108, if program 1100 detects anomalies in the performed measurements, it prompts the student. The prompt can for example, take the form of a message dialog displayed in the "Analysis" window 500. In response, the student can redo the measurement. In this way, the interactive features of FIGS. 10 and 11 essentially provide an on-line tutor for remotely located students.

As disclosed in the above teaching, Stephens merely discloses a participant interacting with data acquisition unit 108 and a local participant at local workstation 104 (which functions as a second destination). Referencing figure 1 in Stephens, local workstation 104 communicates with computer system 100 (which functions as a server) through communications channel 20. While data acquisition unit 108 is within computer system 100, local workstation 104 is external to computer system 100 and is not within computer system 100. Thus, Stephens fails to teach or even suggest the feature of "selecting a second destination within the server to interact with the one or more users."

Claim 10 similarly includes "logic that selects a second destination within the server to interact with the one or more users." Also, claim 11 includes "a code segment that selects a second destination within the server to interact with the one or more users." Moreover, claims 2-9 ultimately depends from claim 1 and claims 12-19 ultimately depends from claim 11. Thus, claims 2-9 and 12-19 are patentable for at least the above reasons. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-19.

Claims 20-76 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Daniels in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,029,195 (Herz).

Regarding claim 20, the combination of Daniels and Herz does not even suggest the feature of "dynamically adding a second virtual instructor." (Emphasis added.) The Office Action admits that (Page 10, first paragraph.):

> Daniels is silent regarding: dynamically adding second virtual instructor.

The Office Action alleges that (Page 10, first paragraph.):

> Herz discloses teacher load balancing system including dynamically adding second virtual instructor (second teacher) (see col. 94, lines 47-67).

Herz does disclose (Column 94, lines 47-67):

> 4. Virtual Classroom
>
> In one approach school activities (from either one or a large number of schools) may be accessible for participation remotely. Classroom lectures, continuing education seminars, conferences, tutorials for job training (or on-going job training requirements) may apply. The most exemplary application however is the virtual classroom. Students may use nearest neighbor indexing to either describe or present a particular topic or problems or a query. The system will recommend the most appropriate on-line lecture either live, if the student wishes to interact (e.g., recommending the next scheduled time) or the most appropriate pre-recorded lecture. For solutions to problems, a virtual tutor involving (either a live or pre-recorded single (closed) session or multi-student session may be presented similarly) or the student may receive a recommendation of the name of the most skilled or experienced faculty or student recommended tutor. In the classroom application the student may either present questions on-line to the lecturer (throughout the lecture or at pre-designated intervals) or the best ones may be selected by a moderator.

The above teaching in Herz merely discloses a system that recommends the most appropriate lecture based on a particular topic, problem, or query. However, the above teaching in Herz does not suggest anything about teacher load balancing or adding a second virtual instructor.

Claims 29 and 30 include similar features as discussed above. Claim 29 includes "logic that dynamically adds a second virtual instructor." Also, claim 30 includes "code that dynamically adds a second virtual instructor." Moreover, claims 21-28 ultimately depend from claim 20 and claims 31-38 ultimately depend from claim 30. Thus, claims 21-28 and 31-38 are patentable for at least the above reasons. The Applicants request reconsideration of claims 20-38.

Regarding claim 58, the combination of Daniels and Herz does not even suggest the features of "updating the student profile during a simulation without disruption to the simulation." The Office Action alleges that (Page 15, fourth paragraph):

> As per claims 58, Daniels et al disclose a method for establishing virtual class room (class room 28), comprising the steps: connecting virtual classroom (fig. 4, element 28) and one or more users (see col. 3, lines 15-40 and col. 4, lines 19-50 and col. 6, lines 37-64); selecting a presentation type within the classroom to interact with one or more users (see fig. 4, and col. 3, lines 15-40 and col. 4, lines 19-50); coupling the one or more users through the server based on the selected destination (see fig. 4, and col. 3, lines 15-40 and col. 4, lines 19-50); and establishing interaction parameters (providing support functions) for the one or [more] users based on the selected destination (see fig. 4, and col. 3, lines 15-40 and col. 4, lines 19-50).

The Office Action admits that (Page 16, first paragraph.):

> Daniels does not explicitly disclose selecting based on student profile.

The Office Action alleges that (Page 16, first paragraph.):

> Herz discloses teacher load balancing system including dynamically adding second virtual instructor (second teacher) (see col. 94, lines 47-67).

The Office Action fails to establish a case of *prima facie* obviousness because the Office Action fails to even discuss (and consequently to show any prior art that suggests) the feature of "updating the student profile during a simulation without disruption to the simulation." As discussed above, Herz merely discloses a system that recommends the most appropriate lecture based on a particular topic, problem or query.

Independent claim 67 similarly includes "logic that updates the student profile during a simulation without disruption to the simulation." Also, claim 68 includes "a code segment that updates the student profile during a simulation without disruption to the simulation." Moreover, claims 59-66 ultimately depend from claim 58 and claims 69-76 ultimately depend from claim 68. Thus, claims 59-66 and 69-76 are patentable for at least the above reasons. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 58-76.

Conclusions

All objections and rejections have been addressed. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 10, 2005

Kenneth F. Smolik
Registration No. 44,344
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606-7407
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001